




## STATE OF INDIANA

MITCHELL E. DANIELS, JR., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION  
Procurement Division  
402 W Washington Street, Room W468  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
317 / 232-3053

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: December 21, 2011

To: Nate Day, Director of Strategic Sourcing 

From: Frank Poole, Assistant Account Manager, IOT

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 11-70  
Job Profiling and Assessment Solution for the  
Indiana Department of Workforce Development

#### Estimated Amount of One Year Contract: \$1,285,200

Based on the evaluation of our team, we recommend for selection **ACT, Inc** to begin contract negotiations to provide a Job Profiling and Assessment solution for the Indiana Department of Workforce Development. Of the annual contract value, ACT, Inc, is committed to subcontract 9% to Priller and Associates, Inc. (a certified Women's Business). Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from two (2) vendors:

- ACT
- Aviation Core Matrix

The proposals were evaluated by IDWD and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (35 points)
- Pricing Proposal (20 points)
- Minority Business Participation (10 points)
- Woman-Owned Business Participation (10 points)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in section 3.2 ("Evaluation Criteria") of the RFP.

Scoring was completed as follows:

#### A. Adherence to Requirements

Two proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All of the respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were then evaluated based on their business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

## **B. Management Assessment/Quality**

### **Business Proposal**

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's business information provided in the business proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess each respondent's ability to serve the state: experience in the government sector, financial information, and references.

### **Technical Proposal**

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's proposal for job profiling recommendations, job profiling process, assessment tool needs, foundational skills remediation component, certification/certificate process, and transmission of assessment results..

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of each respondent's proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, Section 2.4, as well as specific questions that respondents were asked to respond to in the RFP and clarifications.

Results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>MAQ SCORE (35 Max)</b>
ACT	29.75
Aviation Core Matrix	3.00

During business and technical proposal evaluation, the evaluation team observed the following regarding each respondent, which supports the evaluation team's ultimate scoring of the respondents' proposals. This is not intended to be an exhaustive discussion of what the evaluation team considered, but attempts to highlight some of the primary considerations that led to the evaluation team's scores.

#### **ACT Inc.**

ACT scored 29.75 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. In the judgment of the evaluation team, ACT's solution meets the requirements stated in the RFP scope of work. The job profiling and worker assessments are in depth, detailed and thorough. The profiling piece and the assessments are clearly relatable. The assessments have been modified to provide lower level entry options. Security is clearly a priority with ACT.

#### **Aviation Core Matrix**

Aviation Core Matrix scored 3.00 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. The product being provided is specific to the aviation industry. The assessments and job profiling are not easily transferable to other industries. There is no remediation for low skill levels and no validated relationship between the assessment and the skills identified for job profiles. The self assessment does not satisfy the required expectations for the tool. Details about the training were not provided. The assessments in this solution are indefinitely valid which is unacceptable. This solution also lacks the ability to transmit data to other DWD applications via web services.

### C. Cost Proposal

Price is measured against the state's baseline cost for this scope of work. The cost that the state is currently paying will constitute the baseline cost. Cost scoring points will be assigned as follows:

- Respondents who meet the state's current baseline cost will receive zero (0) cost points.
- Respondents who propose a decrease to the state's current costs will receive positive points at the same rate as bid increasing cost.
- Respondents who propose an increase to the state's current cost will receive negative points at the same rate as bid lowering cost.
- Respondents who propose a 10% decrease to the state's current baseline cost will receive all of the available cost points.
- If multiple respondents decrease costs below 10% of the current baseline, an additional 5 points will be added to the respondent proposing the lowest cost to the state.

Both proposals received exceeded the 10% savings and the updated cost scores are reflected in this table. ACT was awarded 5 bonus points for providing the lowest cost which was over 30% under the baseline in the RFP.

**Table 2: Final Cost Scores**

RESPONDENT	COST SCORE (-20 to +20)
ACT	25.00
Aviation Core Matrix	20.00

### D. Short List

Combined final MAQ (business and technical proposal) and cost proposal scores were as follows:

**Table 3: Pre-Short List Scores**

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (35 Max)	COST SCORE (-20 to +20)	TOTAL PRE- SHORT LIST SCORE (55 Max)
ACT	29.75	25.00	54.75
Aviation Core Matrix	3.00	20.00	23.00

The evaluation team met to review the Management Assessment/Quality and Cost Proposal scores (out of 55 maximum possible points). There was a natural break in the scores above, and Aviation Core Matrix was eliminated from moving on to the final round of scoring. The remaining respondent was deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the final evaluation step – IDOA Indiana Economic Impact, Buy Indiana, and Minority and Woman-Owned Business Participation scoring.

## **E. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the remaining respondent in the following areas – Buy Indiana (10 points), Indiana Economic Impact (15 points), and Minority and Women Business Participation (10 points each) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Buy Indiana, Indiana Economic Impact, and Minority and Women Business Participation information with the respondents. Once the final MWBE and IEI forms were received from respondents, the total scores out of 80 possible points were tabulated, and are as follows:

A Best and Final Offer was requested from ACT. The BAFO request was answered with the respondent lowering the evaluated one year cost by 2.7%. There were additional savings proposed for renewal costs for years 2, 3, and 4 for a possible total contract savings of over 16% if renewal years are utilized.

**Table 3: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>MAQ SCORE (35 max)</b>	<b>COST SCORE (20 max)</b>	<b>MBE (10 max)</b>	<b>WBE (10 max)</b>	<b>TOTAL SCORE (100 max)</b>
ACT	29.75	25.00	0.00	10.00	64.75

## **Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the state scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet the needs of the state. The team evaluated proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

This agreement will be for a period of one (1) year. At the discretion of the state, there may be three (3) one (1) year renewals.